

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 24 2006

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed April 25, 2006.

35 USC 101 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 101, because it is alleged that the operations claimed produce no useful, tangible result. Applicant disagrees. For example, "adjusting a control register" is a useful, tangible result. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection is baseless.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly claim that which applicant regards as the invention. Particularly, the Office Action asserts that because applicant claims that a control register is set to a default value if a saved value is equal to an initial value, it is necessary for applicant to claim what is saved if the saved value is not equal to an initial value. Applicant, submits there is no such requirement to claim all possible outcomes of a condition to satisfy 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are presently in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 12-15, 19, 21, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Juffa (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,117). Specifically, independent

claims 1, 10, 19, and 25 are rejected as being anticipated by Juffa. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 25 claim, *inter alia*, that the memory image is generated by performing a save state operation (in claims 1, 10, and 19) and an instruction (in claim 25). Juffa, on the other hand, does not teach a memory image or mask storage area as claimed by applicant nor a memory image or mask storage area that is generated by the performance of a save state operation or any other operation or instruction, as claimed by Applicant in presently amended claims 1, 10, 19, and 25.

However, the Office Action characterizes the architectural flag register of Figure 6B as being a "memory image" to support the rejection. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the architectural flag register of Juffa constitutes a "memory image" as claimed, then Juffa does not teach the memory image (architectural flag register) being generated by the performance of a save state operation or instruction. However, Applicant submits that Juffa not only fails to teach generating a memory image, but fails to teach a memory image (or other storage area) generated as a result of performing a save state operation or other instruction.

The Office Action further incorrectly characterizes saving one or more flags (FCOMI, FCOMIP, etc.) as "generating a memory image" as claimed by Applicant. Applicant submits that saving flags or other data is not equivalent to generating a memory image. Under the Examiner's interpretation of Juffa, Juffa would have to teach generating the architectural flag register in order to anticipate Applicant's "generating a memory image" in the claims. Juffa clearly does not generate register or any other storage structure in response to performing a state save operation. Juffa may store some data in a register in response to performing a state save operation, but this is not

the same as generating a memory image in response to performing a state save operation, as claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1, 3-6, 10, 12-15, 19, 21, and 23-26 are presently in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections


Claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 22, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Juffa (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,117) in view of Temple (U.S. Patent No. 5,875,342). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are now moot in view of the above comments regarding independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 25. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 22, and 27-29 are presently in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Erik Metzger at (512) 732 – 3922.

If there are any additional fees due, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: October 24, 2006



Thomas Ferrill
Reg. No. 42,532

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300